Remarks

This is in response to the Office Action dated May 10, 2007. We thank the Examiner for the indication of allowability for claims 5, 6, 15, 16, 33-36 and 47. Apart from the subject matter of claim 47, the claims have not been written in independent form at this time. It is believed that the amendments and arguments submitted herein render the intervening claims allowable.

With respect to section 1 of the Official Action regarding the objections to the Drawings, we respectfully submit that the rejection is without merit and should be withdrawn. The Applicant respectfully submits that the Figures are fully labeled with each element in the Figures being identified by a reference number. We respectfully submit that the Figures are fully compliant with rule 1.84 of the rules.

If the Examiner is referring to section 37 C.F.R. 1.84(o) relating to legends, we quote the rule "Legends. Suitable descriptive legends may be used subject to approval by the Office, or may be required by the examiner <u>where necessary for understanding of the drawing</u>. They should contain as few words as possible"(emphasis added). We respectfully submit that no such legend is necessary for understanding the drawings. The drawings, when viewed by a person skilled in the art willing to understand with reference to the specification are understandable as currently on file. Accordingly we respectfully request that the objections to the drawings be withdrawn.

Claims 1 and 11 have been amended to specify that there are plurality of layer identifiers associated with a plurality of labels into label stack. Similarly, claim 48 has been amended to clarify that there is a plurality of layer identifiers for a plurality of labels.

Claim 21 has been canceled and claim 22 has been rewritten into independent form including an amendment to introduce the label stack and clarify that the switching controller ascertains on the basis of at least one of a plurality of layer identifiers contained in the label stack.

Claims 25, 26 and 27 have been canceled and the dependencies to claims 28, 29 and 31 have been suitably amended.

With respect to the rejection to claim 11 we respectfully submit that the amended claim clearly differentiates over the Boodaghians reference. The Boodaghians reference only discusses lable stack having a single bit field 3 indicating the bottom of the label stack. Accordingly, it does not include a plurality of layer identifies associated with a plurality of labels in the label stack. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections to the claims is now moot.

Regarding the rejection to claim 14, neither Figure 1 nor column 2 of Boodaghians teaches wherein the label stacking includes a layer identifier associated with each label in the label stack. Boodaghians only includes a single bit field indicated in the bottom of the label stack which is only capable of identifying the bottom label of the label stack. Accordingly, it does not and can not identify a layer identifier associated with each label in the label stack as claimed. Therefore we respectfully submit that original claim 14 was allowable even without the present amendment. Accordingly, we respectfully submit that claims 11 and all claims dependent from it are allowable as are claims 1 and all claims that depend from it. Independent claim 22 is now allowable over the cited art for the reasons given.

Claim 41, 42, 43 and 47 have been canceled and the subject matter of claims 41, 42, 43 and 47 have been incorporated into claim 38.

With respect to the rejection to claim 48, the claim has been amended to clarify that the data packet contains a plurality of labels and a plurality of label identifiers which is clearly not taught by Boodaghians. With respect to rejection to claim 49, the claim has been amended to clarify that the means for switch is on the basis of a layer identifier for each label contained in the data packet which is clearly not taught by Boodaghians.

Accordingly it is respectfully submitted that amended claims are now allowable over the Boodaghians reference and a Notice of Allowance is hereby requested.

No fee is believed due for this submission. However, Applicant authorizes the Commissioner to debit any required fee from Deposit Account No. 501593, in the name of Borden Ladner Gervais LLP. The Commissioner is further authorized to debit any additional amount required, and to credit any overpayment to the above-noted deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

BETTS, Malcolm et al.

By: /Jeffrey M. Measures/

Jeffrey M. Measures
Reg. No. 40,272
Borden Ladner Gervais LLP
World Exchange Plaza
100 Queen Street, Suite 1100
Ottawa, ON K1P 1J9
CANADA
Tel: (613) 237-5160
Fax: (613) 787-3558
E-mail: ipinfo@blgcanada.com

JMM/dbm